



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Chanson, p. 63,¹⁸

"Soffert i ai moult douloureux damage
Et endure mainte grant maladie."

In the former of these *Chansons*, as in so much of the amorous poetry of the time, the reference is to a wound caused by Love or Love's dart. The artificial or unreal nature of the "sickness" is fairly obvious. Such is not the case in those visions or other long poems where the experience of a lover is related. The poets of the Middle Ages who describe at length their experiences in the service of Love make use of this literary artifice of a lover's sickness which was so common in the fantastic love-poetry of the troubadours. But the narrative element adds to the convincingness of the situation. The very nature of their poems gave inevitably to these portrayals of the effects of love a greater appearance of reality than could exist in the usual lyric "complaint."

In the light of these quotations, taken from some of the French love-poets of the time, Chaucer's confession of sleeplessness and his guess at the cause of it may be satisfactorily explained. The complaint about sleeplessness, the troubles which arise therefrom, the idea of the length of the sickness and the unique nature of the cure—all these elements are closely paralleled in these Old French poems. Yet in these conventional love complaints, there is not the impression of actuality nor the seemingly personal element which we find in Chaucer. The explanation of the difference lies in Chaucer's individual treatment of this conventional love material.

In the *Book of the Duchesse*, Chaucer is writing a dream-poem which is to treat of love. His models are before him. A definite type of love-vision was already established. Within the various poems of this sort he would find many devices to carry on what one may call the plot. Characteristic expressions of these love-poets would moreover attract his attention and would be recalled in the composition of his own poem. But with his almost perverse ingenuity in shaping material to his own ends, and with his wonderful ability to stamp this material with his personal seal, he leaves an expression often on one's mind that here is undoubtedly an impression of Chau-

cer's own feelings or experience. The material and ideas which Chaucer makes use of in his love-poems are commonplace; the treatment is individual, personal.¹⁹ So with this passage in the *Duchesse*. What he does is to combine certain of these conventional expressions of the love-poets, vary them as he sees fit, and add to the resulting combination his own individual touch, which gives even the veriest commonplace an atmosphere of originality and at times of personal significance. Love-poets before had in fancy suffered from lack of sleep and had told of their troubles. Other poets had described their illnesses, sometimes lasting for years, and the impossibility of cure except through the hands of one physician. Chaucer, likewise, is unable to sleep, is troubled with vexatious thoughts. The cause of it all is the very "sickness" under which other love-poets had lingered; and the one physician is his mistress—she alone can free him from his trouble. There is nothing new or especially striking about Chaucer's experience. It is entirely conventional, and is just what, saving Chaucer's peculiar genius, any other love-poet of the time might have used to tell of his own discomforts as a servant of Love.

W. OWEN SYPHERD.

Harvard University.

THE USE MADE BY MONTAIGNE OF SOME SPECIAL WORDS.

In studying Montaigne's language, some interesting peculiarities become apparent in the manner in which he regarded and employed certain words. Among the most marked—or at least

¹⁹ See, for instance, in the following poems, the various seemingly personal expressions of his experience as a lover or as a servant of Love: *Duchesse*, ll. 30–43; *H. of F.*, I, ll. 245–8; II, ll. 614–640; III, ll. 2002–2018; *Parlement*, ll. 8–14, and ll. 155–161 (ed. by Skeat, *Minor Poems*); *Troilus*, I, ll. 15–21; II, ll. 19–21; III, ll. 41–44, and ll. 1331–1333; *Legend Prolog.*, B., ll. 490–1 (Globe Edition). No actual love experience of Chaucer as a man can with any show of reason be made out from these passages. But they do have this personal impress which differentiates them from similar expressions of the medieval love-poets; and at the same time arouses in the mind of the reader a vague suspicion of some hidden autobiographical significance.

¹⁸ Thibaut, p. 63.

among those of which the peculiarity in his usage can be most easily pointed out—are the following : Goust (and Gouter), Noble (and Noblesse), Operation, Monstrueux (and Monstrueusement), Patron, Garnir, Patrie ; and from another point of view Iceluy.

'Goust' is a word frequently employed by Montaigne with its usual meaning, both in its proper and its figurative senses ; the figurative senses having occasionally somewhat unusually extended significance of meaning. He used the word some sixty times in the first two books of the *Essais*, published in 1580 ; in the Third Book, published in 1588, it is to be found only sixteen times and four times in passages added to the earlier essays. But in the posthumous edition of 1595 (prepared in some degree, at least, for the press by Montaigne himself), occurs the singularity to be remarked about this word, and others. In that edition, this word is either changed for another, or simply omitted, forty-five times, so that instead of finding it eighty times as in the preceding edition, it occurs only thirty-five times. The interest of this fact lies, of course, in its indicating Montaigne's careful correction of his style verbally ; if, indeed, it be his own carefulness, and not that of his first editors ; a point—and an important point—to be considered later. It is of the more importance because the change in the word sometimes produces a considerable change in the character of the sentence ; for while the place of 'goust' is usually taken by words as nearly synonymous as 'saveur,' 'appetit,' 'sentiment,' 'fantasie,' 'plaisir,' we find sometimes as great a change as this : "On employe beaucoup d'aage à dresser des enfans aux choses auxquelles ils ne peuvent prendre goust : (1588) : [auxquelles ils ne peuvent prendre pied (1595)]."¹ This special instance of change connects itself with another indication of Montaigne's scrupulousness with regard to the repetition of words. At the same time, apparently, that he made this change of "pied" for "goust," he added a clause at the end of the next sentence, in which, speaking of the presages given by "les mouvements" of children, he remarked : "Platon . . . me semble leur donner trop d'auctorité." But we learn

from M. Gustave Brunet, who made sixty years ago the only detailed examination on record of the manuscript notes in the Bordeaux copy of the *Essais*,² (which is believed to be the source of the changes and additions in the posthumous edition of 1595), that in writing this sentence Montaigne wrote first : "Platon me semble leur donner beaucoup trop de pied" and then changed the last words to "trop d'autorité." Brunet did not observe, or does not say that he observed, the change a few lines above of "goust" for "pied," which is the probable explanation of this change of "de pied" for "d'autorité."³

Some further illustrations may be worth while of sentences in which the thought is somewhat changed by the change of word. In the following instance Montaigne's first conception was connected with one of our five senses—that of taste—his later conception with another—that of sight—as familiar to the more modern mind as the first is unfamiliar. "Nature nous desrobbe le goust de nostre perte et empirement (1588) : [la veuë

² *Les Essais de Michel de Montaigne*. Leçons inédites, recueillies par un membre de l'Académie de Bordeaux [Gustave Brunet], sur les manuscrits autographes conservés à la Bibliothèque publique de cette ville. Paris : Chez Techener, 1844, Cent exemplaires.—These transcripts are very incomplete and inadequate, and sometimes incorrect.

³ What Brunet observed here or elsewhere is of little weight as regards the subject of this paper, for though he gives a few examples—"quelques échantillons"—of the differences between the editions of 1588 and 1595, he gives but few. Had he devoted more time and study to the work he might have forestalled these present investigations, and conducted them under the most favorable conditions, which can only be found at Bordeaux. Brunet's notes concern themselves almost entirely with corrections that Montaigne made and then effaced or altered (as in the above citation), and which rightly, consequently, do not appear in the pages of the posthumous edition, but which have a certain interest in showing the first form Montaigne gave to his thought. Some of his notes are of value as strengthening the presumptive evidence that the changes we are examining were probably made by Montaigne's own hand. For example : "Montaigne s'ecrie : 'Revenons à nos bouteilles.' Le manuscrit prouve que cinq fois il a effacé, rétabli, remanié cette exclamation originale ; il avait d'abord mis *revenons* ; ensuite *tourrons* lui a plu davantage ; puis c'est à *retourrons* qu'il a donné la préférence, et il a fini par s'en tenir à son premier mot de *revenons*." Liv. II, 2. This is part of a passage added in 1595.

¹ Liv. I, 26 (25).

de . . . (1595)]”⁴ Again: “Ce siecle . . . est si plombé que le goust mesmes de la vertu en est à dire (1580): [est si plombé que je ne dis pas l’execution, mais l’imagination de la vertu en est à dire, 1595].”⁵ “Cette ame pert le goust du souverain bien stoïque (1580): [pert l’usage: 1595].”⁷ “Voyons les dernieres paroles d’Epicurus . . . elles sont grandes et dignes d’un tel philosophe, mais si [i. e., néanmoins] ont elles quelque goust de la recommandation de son nom, et de cette humeur qu’il avoit decriée par ses preceptes (1580): [quelque merque. . . . 1595].”⁸ “J’ay le goust tendre et difficile, et notamment en mon endroit (1580): [J’ay le jugement . . . 1595].”⁹ Here it would seem as if Montaigne had not perceived that by substituting this word for the other, and by throwing out two lines, he brings “jugement” immediately into play again: “je n’ay rien du mien dequoy contenter mon jugement.” We have also here an instance of how uncertain it is what may be the true text of Montaigne; this is indicated by the following fact. Naigeon, in his edition of the *Essais* (1802) professes to print Montaigne’s manuscript corrections with more accuracy than his first editors would seem to have done (but Naigeon is himself very inaccurate). He inserts here six words, so that the sentence which in the text of 1595 (and almost all subsequent editions) reads: “J’ay le jugement tendre et difficile et notamment en mon endroit: je me sens flotter et fleschir de foiblesse,” reads in Naigeon’s text: “J’ay le jugement tendre et difficile et notamment en mon endroit: je me desadvoue sans cesse et je me sens flotter et fleschir de foiblesse.”

To continue: “Au reffort, que nous mangeons pour le goust . . . (1580): [pour la nourriture . . . 1595].”¹⁰ “A combien peu tient la resolution au mourir! la distance et difference de quelques heures, la seule consideration de la compagnie nous en rend le goust tout divers (1588): [nous en rend l’apprehension diverse. 1595].”¹¹

⁴ Liv. I, 20 (19).

⁵ Liv. I, 37 (36).

⁶ Where this date of 1580 is here given it means that the passage appeared in that edition, and remained unchanged in the edition of 1588.

⁷ Liv. II, 12.

⁸ Liv. II, 16.

⁹ Liv. II, 17.

¹⁰ Liv. II, 37.

¹¹ Liv. III, 12.

‘Gouster,’ which may be examined in connection with ‘Goust,’ receives much the same treatment from Montaigne. His use of it is naturally not so frequent, and is perhaps somewhat more peculiar. He changes the word thirteen times, and suppresses it once, leaving about as many passages untouched. The word that takes its place is usually ‘sentir,’ ‘jouir,’ ‘taster’ and the like. One instance shows how peculiar the original use was, and connects itself with the first illustration above of ‘Goust,’ the change being the exchange of one of our five senses for another, both used metaphorically. “Ils jugent que les bons reiglements ne se peuvent gouster qu’au son de la trompette (1588): [ne se peuvent entendre qu’au son de la trompette: 1595].”¹²

Another peculiar use is the following: “Plusieurs nations qui n’ont encores gousté aucun usage de vestemens . . . (1580): [qui n’ont encores essayé nul¹³ usage de vestemens: 1595].”¹⁴

Twice ‘Gouster’ is changed for a verb—‘recevoir’—that seems at first sight to have little relation with it: “Je ne puis gouster cette passion dequoy on embrasse les enfans à peine encore nez (1580): [Je ne puis recevoir cette passion: 1595].”¹⁵ “Nous ne goustons pas aisément la medicine que nous entendons (1580): [Nous ne recevons pas aisément . . . 1595].”¹⁶

Turning now to the word ‘Noble’ (the adjective), we find it used with natural frequency in the edition of 1595; but it had been used twenty-six times more in the edition of 1588. Montaigne suppressed it eleven times and changed it in fifteen instances for its synonyms ‘beau,’ ‘digne,’ ‘superbe,’ ‘estimable,’ ‘cognu,’ ‘excellent,’ ‘riche,’ ‘honorable,’ ‘brave,’ ‘notable,’ ‘glorieux.’

‘Noblesse’ likewise, in some half dozen cases was, in 1595, suppressed or changed to ‘dignité,’ ‘beauté,’ ‘félicité.’

¹² Liv. II, 10.

¹³ This employ of ‘nul’ with the negative particle, is not infrequent in the edition of 1588, but in that of 1595 ‘nul’ in such phrases is in the great majority of cases changed to ‘aucun,’ as ‘nullement’ is to ‘aucunement’; and as ‘nul’ is for the most part when used in the positive sense of ‘aucun.’ Here, oddly, it is a change in the reverse direction.

¹⁴ Liv. II, 12.

¹⁵ Liv. II, 8.

¹⁶ Liv. II, 37.

'Operation' occurs twenty-seven times or more in 1588. In 1595, it is changed nineteen times, but apparently not from any definite dislike to the word, as it is used three times, at least, in this edition, for the first time. In the passages in which it is changed, the word, with three exceptions, is always in the plural, and the words substituted for it are chiefly 'oeuvres,' 'choses,' 'effects,' 'actions,' 'functions,' 'offices,' 'puissances.' In a passage where Montaigne speaks of "les operations de nostre veuë" in 1588,¹⁷ and the word remained in 1595, Mlle. de Gournay changed it in 1635 to "les offices de nostre veuë," which text was adopted by Naigeon in 1802, and has been followed by Le Clere, Louandre and all the modern editors.

'Monstrueux' has a similar fate. Half a dozen sentences are left untouched which contain this word in the sense of 'merveilleux,' 'prodigieux,' 'horrible'; but sixteen times the word disappears; suppressed once; in the other instances changed to 'prodigieux,' 'merveilleux,' 'fantastique,' 'lourd,' 'informe,' 'extravagant,' 'farouche,' 'desreglé,' 'enorme,' 'difforme,' 'vilain,' 'incroyable,' 'inepte.'¹⁸

On the other hand, 'monstrueux' is in 1595 favored by being put in the place of another word. In 1588, speaking of those who shrink from being seen when eating, Montaigne exclaims: "Quel animal desnaturé, qui se fait horreur à soy-même!" In 1595 this is changed to "Quel monstrueux animal, qui . . ."¹⁹

I have found 'Monstrueusement' but once in the edition of 1588 (Liv. III, 5); it is changed in 1595 to 'merveilleusement.'

'Patron' I have found sixteen times in 1588, always used, figuratively, in the sense of 'modèle,' that is, 'an exemplar,' 'a pattern.' It is changed nine times; *e. g.*, "le reste de la France prend pour patron ce qui se faict à la court (1588): [prend pour regle la regle de la cour: 1595]";

speaking of Homer: "un patron (1588) [un maistre: 1595] tres parfait en la connoissance de toutes choses"; "pour servir de patron de mes meurs (1588): [de montre de mes meurs: 1595]. "L'exemple est un patron libre, universel et à tout sens (1588): [L'exemple est un miroüer vague, etc.: 1595]." The other changes are for the most part to 'exemplaire' and 'modelle.' It is used five times in 1595 for the first time, always with these significations; and in three other passages it is substituted for other words; *e. g.*, "Bien qu'ils [mes caprices] soyent nez chez moy et sans patron (1595): [sans exemple: 1588]." Speaking of "l'esprit humain": "C'est un mouvement irregulier, perpetuel, sans patron et sans but: (1595): [sans arrest et sans but: 1588]." Speaking of Socrates: "On a dequoy . . . de presenter l'image de ce personnage à tous patrons et formes de perfection (1595): [à tous exemples et formes . . . 1588]."

Montaigne's treatment of these last words would seem to indicate only great verbal carefulness; but in the following one less frequently employed, and never freshly used in 1595, we may catch a hint, as in our first examples, of a certain disapproval.

'Garnir' is changed fifteen times. The past participle is the form most used; and for this is substituted 'doué,' 'pourvu,' 'revestu,' 'fourni,' 'peuplé,' while the infinitive is replaced by 'meubler,' or by 'armer,' as the participle is in the following sentence: "Nature . . . m'ayant peu garny de force, m'a garny d'insensibilité . . . (1588): [Nature . . . m'ayant desarmé de force, m'a armé d'insensibilité . . . 1595]."

The word remains unchanged some half dozen times.

With regard to another word, Montaigne's use of which I have not studied with thoroughness, I have been struck by a fact that is somewhat odd when considered in relation to the history of the word. The word is 'Patrie,' which came into use in the sixteenth century. Its 'invention' has been ascribed to Joachim du Bellay and he was in his own day reproached with it as a neologism. But it was employed before him by Claude Gruget, by Etienne Dolet and by Hugues Salel.²⁰

¹⁷ Liv. II, ch. 12: Near the end; just after the quotation beginning *Lurida præterea*.

¹⁸ In the passage, first printed in 1595, in the chapter on 'Tristesse,' where that quality is spoken of a "sot et vilain ornament," the phrase appears in Naigeon's edition (1802) as "sot et monstrueuse ornament." This may be believed to be a case where Montaigne's manuscript shows various readings. See above, note 3.

¹⁹ Liv. III, 5.

²⁰ See an article by A. Delboulle in the *Rev. d'hist. litt. de la France*, Oct.-Dec., 1901.

In 1570 Montaigne employs it in a letter to the Chancellor de L'Hospital. Writing of Estienne de la Boétie, he speaks of "la tendre amour qui il portoit à sa miserable patrie." In 1580 he uses, in the essay 'Du Pedantisme,' the expression "la deffence de sa patrie"; again in the same edition, in the essay 'De l'Amitié,' is the phrase "le repos de sa patrie." But in both these instances the word is changed in 1595 to "pais." It almost seems as if Montaigne had been at first attracted by the neologism, and then had disapproved it. But it remains unchanged in a 1580 passage of the essay 'De la Coustume,' and in another in the essay 'De la Solitude,' and in a 1588 passage of the essay 'Coustume de l'isle de Cea,' which are the only times I have observed it in the edition of 1595. It is not used, I think, in any passage added in 1595. 'Pays' is used, in various connotations, with natural frequency, but not very often.

Another word that has also had a peculiar fate (but a different one from those already mentioned), in the pages of the *Essais*, is 'Iceluy' and its feminine and plural forms, 'Icelle' and 'Iceux'. It is the old form, dating from the eleventh century, of 'Celui,' more particularly used for 'Celui dont on a parlé auparavant.' It was already in Montaigne's day somewhat antiquated. The grammarian and translator, Louis Meygret, writing in the middle of the sixteenth century, notes: "Iceluy, icelle, desquelles les courtisans n'usent pas communement." It is not to be found in the writers of the seventeenth century, except as an intentional archaism.

And 'Iceluy' is to be found only twice, 'Icelle' five times and 'Iceux' and 'Icelles' three times in the 1588 edition of the *Essais*; ten times in all; but in that of 1595 'Iceluy' occurs, *additionally*, seven times; 'Icelle' twenty times, and 'Iceux' and 'Icelles' ten times; thirty-seven times in all, making the whole number of times these words are used, forty-six; (in one instance in an extraordinarily clumsy sentence of 1580 (Liv. II, 8), the phrase is changed in 1595, and 'iceux' drops out). These words are found ten times in Montaigne's translation of *Sebond*, and four times in his *Voyages*; but it would seem as if they had become suddenly, in his last three or four years, a favorite form with him. Their

increased frequency of use is not occasioned by their taking the place of other words, with perhaps only two exceptions.²¹ The passages in which these words appear are, for the most part, of some length, and are more often inserted in the earlier than in the later essays.

In the 1635 edition Mlle. de Gournay has occasionally changed these words, *e. g.*: "A l'aventure, pourroit sembler inutile et contre nature la faculté de sommeil . . . en'estoit que par iceluy nature nous instruit que . . . et, dès la vie nous presente l'eternel estat qu'elle nous garde après icelle pour nous y accoustumer."²² The "iceluy" Mlle. de Gournay changed to "ce moyen," the "icelle" to "elle," not perceiving, unfortunately, that 'elle' would refer to "la nature" and not (as 'icelle' does) to "la vie."

This is the change—to 'eux' and 'elles' or 'ceux' and 'celles'—that Mlle. de Gournay makes oftenest, some half dozen times; once she simply omits the word; twice she supplies other words, as thus: "lors que la vieillesse ou les maladies les approchent de leur mort, la terreur d'icelle [sa terreur: 1635] les remplit d'une nouvelle creance."²³ "C'est une grande place au milieu de laquelle il y a une fosse pleine de bois, et joignant icelle [joignant la fosse: 1635] un lieu relevé . . ."²⁴

The fact that this word has been sometimes changed by Mlle. de Gournay is presumptive evidence that it was not she who more often used it in the edition of 1595. But we have only presumptive evidence to go upon, not only with regard to this, but with regard to the other pecu-

²¹ One of these exceptions is in Liv. II, 31: "Ceux-là se sont donnez beau jeu en nostre temps, qui ont essayé de choquer la verité de nostre creance par les vices de nos gens d'eglise . . . (1588): [la verité de nostre Eglise par les vices des ministres d'icelle . . . 1595]." In the edition of 1635, Mlle. de Gournay changed this to "les vices de ses ministres."

Another exception is in Liv. II, 12, where discussing the doctrine of transmigration, Montaigne remarks, in 1580: "S'il naissoit plus d'animaux qu'ils n'en mourroit, ils disent que les corps seroient en mauvais party, attendant l'infusion de leur ame, et en adviendrait qu'aucuns corps (*i. e.*, que quelques corps) [qu'aucuns d'iceux: 1595] se mourroient avant que d'avoir esté vivans."

²² Liv. II, 6.

²³ Liv. II, 12.

²⁴ Liv. II, 29.

liarities here considered, and with regard also to more interesting points. The reader of the edition of 1595 has absolutely no proof that what he reads is Montaigne's text; it is impossible to assert positively that a single one of the changes of 'Goust' and the other words here dwelt upon were made by Montaigne himself. The duties of editors were not carefully defined in the sixteenth century. This doubt might include many important passages, the manuscript of which no longer exists; they appear to have been written on loose sheets that were laid between the leaves of the Bordeaux volume, and have now disappeared.

But the personal character of Pierre de Brach and Mlle. de Gournay, who worked together in editing the edition of 1595, and their admiring friendship for Montaigne, makes it improbable that they seriously tampered with the text. That they misread it here and there, and sometimes inserted the matter on the loose leaves in wrong places is sufficiently obvious to the student. But the avowal of Mlle. de Gournay of the changes she made in 1635, and their slightness, is good assurance of her previous fidelity.

None the less there would be great interest to a student of Montaigne in a careful study of the volume at Bordeaux, a study that might now be pursued in any part of the world by means of a photographed copy. Several of its pages have already been facsimiled, and published in various books and periodicals, and in more than one of these reproductions differences from the received text are to be found which have not been made public in any other manner; although two or three writers on the subject have given in print still other instances of dissimilarity.²⁵

M. Dezeimeris, the greatest living authority on all that concerns Montaigne, wrote forty years ago: "Si, grâce au trésor conservé par la bibliothèque de Bordeaux, nous pouvons constater que le fond des additions de Montaigne a été fidèlement transcrit, nous pouvons constater aussi que, soit par la faute du transcrit de Brach, soit

par celle de l'imprimeur L'Angelier, soit par celle de la correctrice Mlle. de Gournay, des phrases importantes ont été négligées, des erreurs, des inexactitudes ont été commises et, parfois, la physionomie même du texte a été assez gravement altérée." ²⁶

The lover of Montaigne who should command the volume at Bordeaux to be photographed, would deserve and receive the gratitude of the students of Montaigne. The authorities at the Library were approached on this matter some time ago, and it is believed that they would be pleased and proud to have the work done.

GRACE NORTON.

Cambridge, Mass.

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTE.

FRENCH *mâchefer* = EASTERN DIALECT FORM OF *merdefer*.

Concerning the etymology of the word *mâchefer* (= *slag*), the *Dictionnaire Général* says: "Composé avec *fer* et un premier élément d'explication incertaine." Scheler connects the word with the verb *macher*, *maquer*. Littré thinks the explanation probable, but correctly observes that we should in this case expect *machefer* and not *mâchefer*. A most serious objection to Scheler's view is that a compound of the kind he suggests would designate the instrument with which the iron is beaten and not the slag which falls in the process of beating. Besides *mâchefer* like the English *slag* is applied more particularly to the molten mass of refuse that gathers like scum on the top of the iron in the process of melting the mineral.

The first element of *mâchefer* has no more to do with *macher* than with *mâcher*. The correct origin of the word was suggested to me by a recent article of Antoine Thomas in *Romania*, xxxiv, pp. 177-205 (*Gloses provençales inédites tirées d'un ms. des Derivationes d'Uguccio de Pise*). Among the Provençal words that occur there, is

²⁵ Among others, M. Bonnefon, in an article on Mlle. de Gournay in the *Rev. d'hist. litt.* for 15 jan., 1896. The readings he gives are almost, but not quite, identical with those of Nägeon. He does not say how he obtained them, whether or not by personal examination of the manuscript.

²⁶ Quoted by M. Bonnefon in the above mentioned article.